



Please send us your

FEEDBACK ON THE NHAL ALTERNATIVES AND BOUNDARY EXPANSION

Master planning is the process of envisioning our state land in the decades to come, and making decisions that will lead to the future desired condition for the property. Public involvement and review is an important piece in this process. Your feedback on the NHAL alternatives will give us input for the development of the preferred alternative and ultimately the property master plan.

This feedback form is only one option for comment on the NHAL Alternatives. Feel free to send a letter or an email instead. If you choose to use it, this form separates many of the issues and asks you to evaluate the alternatives while keeping in mind both the property vision and goals and your own values. Most importantly, it asks you to explain the reasons behind your preference for one alternative over another. We encourage you to answer as many questions as you would like—we recognize that the response form is long and addresses many complicated issues. However, your thoughtful feedback will be very helpful in setting direction and filling in the details for the preferred alternative.

Please keep in mind that agreeing with some aspects of an alternative does not mean you are agreeing with all aspects of that alternative. The preferred alternative, our next step in the planning process, will likely combine aspects of many alternatives.

Instructions: Print out the feedback form. Fill out, fold over all three pages with this page on the outside, staple at the bottom, and mail in. Thanks!

----- fold line -----

From: _____

Place
Postage
Here

**Mail to: Denny Leith
NHAL Forest Superintendent
8770 Hwy J.
Woodruff, WI 54568**

---Please keep in mind the property vision and goals as well as your own values as you answer these questions.---

Land Management

Future Desired Conditions: Alternatives 1-6 present a range of objectives for land management. Please indicate which future desired conditions you would prefer on the NHAL, and why. Please address the community types you prefer, such as red and white pine, aspen, white birch, or northern hardwoods. Please also address the forest age you would prefer (economic age, biological age, old growth characteristics). Indicate whether the level of forest management is more or less important to you than the forest community type.

Secondary Results: Alternatives 1-6 present a range of secondary results on aesthetics (how the forest and different management activities appear), forest production, recreation including hunting/trapping and trails, and rare species. Please indicate how these factors influence your preference for individual alternatives, and why.

Additional comments:

---Please keep in mind the property vision and goals as well as your own values as you answer these questions.---

Recreation

Camping: Alternatives A-D present a range of camping options that involve changes in remote, rustic and modern camping, including closing and opening campgrounds, converting family to group campgrounds, increasing the spacing between campsites, and allowing or disallowing generators and electrical hook-ups. Please indicate which camping alternatives you prefer, and why.

Education and Interpretive Center: Alternatives A-D present a range of interpretive developments on the NHAL, including new and more developed nature centers and visitor centers, and new interpretive trails and information. Please indicate which interpretive alternatives you prefer, and why.

Non-motorized trails (ie cross-country ski, hike, bike, horse, and snowshoe trails): Alternatives A-D present a variety of options for non-motorized trails. Please indicate which non-motorized trail you prefer, and why.

Snowmobile trails: Alternative A decreases snowmobile trail miles compared to the current mileage, while Alternatives B-D retain all existing snowmobile trails. Please indicate which snowmobile trail alternatives you prefer, and why.

ATV trails: Alternatives A and B show the NHAL as it currently stands, without ATV trails. Alternative C shows a north-south corridor while Alternative D shows a more extensive network of ATV trails. Please indicate which ATV trail alternatives you prefer, and why.

Boat Landings: Alternative A proposes to remove boat landings in Non-Motorized Areas. Alternatives B, C, and D all propose new boat landings on two lakes. Please indicate which boat landing alternatives you prefer, and why.

---Please keep in mind the property vision and goals as well as your own values as you answer these questions.---

Non-Motorized Areas: Alternative A presents two new Non-Motorized Areas, while Alternatives B, C, and D do not. Non-Motorized Areas provide for silent nonmotorized recreation but still allow for land management. Please indicate which non-motorized area alternative you prefer, and why.

Additional comments:

Wild Resources Areas

Wild Resource Areas Maps 1-5 and their related text present a range of alternatives for wild resource areas on the NHAL. Please read the text carefully to understand what a Wild Resource Area is. Wild Resources Areas provide for remote, silent, non-motorized recreation with little to no sign of human activity. Land management would generally not occur in these areas.

Which alternative shows the amount of the NHAL as a whole that you think should be designated as a Type I or Type II Wild Resources Area, and why?

Do the alternatives show particular areas that you would or would not like to see as Wild Resources Areas? Why or why not?

Are there areas you think should provide silent, non-motorized recreation while still allowing for land management activities? (In other words, should some Wild Resources Areas be changed to Non-Motorized Areas?) Why or why not?

Additional Comments:

---Please keep in mind the property vision and goals as well as your own values as you answer these questions.---

The Range of Alternatives

Did we leave anything out that you would like to see in the range of alternatives?

The Possible Boundary Expansion

Do you favor the possible boundary expansion as presented? Why or why not? Feedback could address general issues or specific areas that were or were not included in the proposed boundary expansion.

Feel free to attach additional pieces of paper if necessary.

We appreciate your feedback. Thank you!